Application No. Applicant(s) 10/043,833 WELLS ET AL. Interview Summary Art Unit Examin r 1639 Jon D Epperson All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Jon D Epperson. (3) Christine S. Ring. (2) Ginger R. Dreger. Date of Interview: 25 July 2003. Type: a) ✓ Telephonic b) ✓ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) \(\sum \) Yes If Yes, brief description: Handout on Pitner et al. Claim(s) discussed: All. Identification of prior art discussed: Pitner et al. Agreement with respect to the claims find was reached. q was not reached. h N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants discussed three cases including 10/082,056, 09/981,547 and 09/043,833. Applicants discussed art rejections including Pitner et al. and Janda et al and also discussed potential claim amendments. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required